

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to the FIGURE. This sheet replaces the original sheet that included the FIGURE, and is being made to use different element numbers.

REMARKS

Claims 6-19 have been amended. Claims 6-19 remain for consideration. No new matter has been added.

The objections and rejections shall be taken up in the order presented in the Official Action.

1. The abstract of the disclosure currently stands objected to.

A replacement abstract has been provided.

2-3. Claims 6-19 currently stand rejected for allegedly being anticipated by the subject matter disclosed in U.S. Patent 6,611,537 to Edens et al. (hereinafter “Edens”).

Claim 6

Claim 6 has been amended to recite the feature “*where the at least one data sink includes a control unit that selectively adapts the decompression of the received compressed data by the bit stream decoder based upon the compression format of the received compressed data, where the format of the received compressed data may be one of a plurality of compression formats.*” Support for this feature is in the specification as filed, specifically on page 19 of this Amendment in the section titled “clean copy of the specification following entry of this amendment.”

A fair and proper reading of Edens reveals that this prior art references fails to disclose the claimed feature regarding the control unit and various aspects thereof. More particularly, the sections of Edens (col. 13, line 24 through col. 14, line 40, and col. 15, lines 52-60) cited in Paragraph 3 on pages 2-4 of the Official Action (col. 13, line 24 through col. 14, line 40, and col. 15, lines 52-60) as the support for the allegedly anticipatory arguments set forth in the Official Action

merely disclose the simple concept of transmission of MPEG2 compressed data within the ring network of Edens. The only disclosure within the cited sections of Edens where any type of control over the data can be exerted is in the following cited section in Edens at col. 14, lines 7-19: *“for example, an MPEG2 movie, received by DSS Tuner 140 or played at CD/DVD player 150 or 160, could be displayed on small television 165 and/or large television 155 (after being decoded by MPEG2 decoders 161 and 151, respectively). The audio extracted by MPEG2 decoder 161 could be transmitted back onto logical ring network 120 and played by left 167 and right 168 amplifier/speakers. The audio extracted by MPEG2 decoder 151 could be transmitted back onto logical ring network 120, processed by DSP (e.g., AC-3 surround sound decoder) 152, and then transmitted back onto logical ring network 120 and played by surround sound amplifier/speakers 153, 154, 156, 157 and 158.”* (emphasis added). Specifically, on page 4 of the Official Action interprets this passage of Edens by contending that *“Edens teaches this limitation (of original claim 14) as DSP 152 is configured to control the selectively (sic) configuration of decoders MPEG, JPEG and/or AC-3 accordingly (col. 14/lines 7-40).”* It is respectfully submitted that this interpretation of Edens is incorrect and based on an improper reading of Edens. The emphasized section of Edens above at col. 14, lines 7-19, when read in conjunction with FIG. 1 of Edens (as referred to in col. 13, line 24), instead teaches that the MPEG2 decoder 151 extracts audio data from the compressed MPEG2 data stream and places the extracted audio data back onto the network where the DSP 152 (which may be an AC-3) decoder processes the audio data and transmits the processed audio data back onto the network where it can be received by the various loudspeakers for audible playback therethrough. As such, this disclosure of Edens cannot be reasonably interpreted to anticipate the specific feature of amended claim 6 of *“where the at least one data sink includes a control unit that selectively adapts the decompression of the received compressed data by the bit stream decoder*

based upon the compression format of the received compressed data, where the format of the received compressed data may be one of a plurality of compression formats.” That is, no control of the adaptation of the decompression of the received compressed data to a particular format is disclosed in Edens.

As a result, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 6 is in condition for allowance and that it be passed to issuance.

Claims 7-14

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims is moot, since each of these claims depends directly or indirectly from amended claim 6, which is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 15

Claim 15 has been amended to recite the features “*where one of the video display device and the audio playback device includes a control unit that selectively adapts the decompression of the received compressed video data to a format of the received compressed video data, where the format of the received compressed video data includes one of a plurality of compression formats, and where the control unit conducts the compressed audio data to one of the video display device and the audio playback device for audio playback thereby.*” Support for these features is in the specification as filed, specifically on page 19 of this Amendment in the section titled “clean copy of the specification following entry of this amendment.”

A fair and proper reading of Edens reveals that Edens fails to disclose this specific claimed feature regarding the control unit and various aspects thereof. More particularly, the sections of

Edens (col. 13, line 24 through col. 14, line 40, and col. 15, lines 52-60) cited in Paragraph 3 on pages 2-4 of the Official Action (col. 13, line 24 through col. 14, line 40, and col. 15, lines 52-60) as the entire support for the allegedly anticipatory arguments set forth in the Official Action merely disclose the simple concept of transmission of MPEG2 compressed data within the ring network of Edens. The only disclosure within the cited sections of Edens where any type of control over the data can be exerted is in the following cited section in Edens at col. 14, lines 7-19: *“for example, an MPEG2 movie, received by DSS Tuner 140 or played at CD/DVD player 150 or 160, could be displayed on small television 165 and/or large television 155 (after being decoded by MPEG2 decoders 161 and 151, respectively). The audio extracted by MPEG2 decoder 161 could be transmitted back onto logical ring network 120 and played by left 167 and right 168 amplifier/speakers. The audio extracted by MPEG2 decoder 151 could be transmitted back onto logical ring network 120, processed by DSP (e.g., AC-3 surround sound decoder) 152, and then transmitted back onto logical ring network 120 and played by surround sound amplifier/speakers 153, 154, 156, 157 and 158.”* (emphasis added). Specifically, on page 4 of the Official Action interprets this passage of Edens by contending that *“Edens teaches this limitation (of original claim 14) as DSP 152 is configured to control the selectively (sic) configuration of decoders MPEG, JPEG and/or AC-3 accordingly (col. 14/lines 7-40).”*

This interpretation of Edens is factually incorrect and based on an improper reading of Edens. The emphasized section of Edens above at col. 14, lines 7-19, when read in conjunction with FIG. 1 of Edens (as referred to in col. 13, line 24), instead teaches that the MPEG2 decoder 151 extracts audio data from the compressed MPEG2 data stream and places the extracted audio data back onto the network where the DSP 152 (which may be an AC-3) decoder processes the audio data and transmits the processed audio data back onto the network where it can be received by the various

loudspeakers for audible playback therethrough. As such, this disclosure of Edens cannot be reasonably interpreted to anticipate the specific feature of amended claim 15 of “*where one of the video display device and the audio playback device includes a control unit that selectively adapts the decompression of the received compressed video data to a format of the received compressed video data, where the format of the received compressed video data includes one of a plurality of compression formats, and where the control unit conducts the compressed audio data to one of the video display device and the audio playback device for audio playback thereby.*” That is, no control of the adaptation of the decompression of the received compressed data to a particular format is disclosed in Edens, nor is there disclosure of the control unit directing the compressed audio data to one of the video display device or the audio display device.

As a result, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 15 is in condition for allowance and that it be passed to issuance.

Claims 16-19

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims is moot, since each of these claims depends directly or indirectly from amended claim 15, which is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 6-19 is respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Patrick O'Shea", written over a horizontal line.

Patrick J. O'Shea

Registration No. 35,305

O'Shea, Getz & Kosakowski, P.C.

1500 Main Street, Suite 912

Springfield, Massachusetts 01115

Telephone: (413) 731-3100, x102